

5-1986

A New Measure of Mature Religiosity

James A. Croxton

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses>



Part of the [Applied Behavior Analysis Commons](#), [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#), and the [Social Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Croxton, James A., "A New Measure of Mature Religiosity" (1986). *Masters Theses & Specialist Projects*. Paper 1669.
<http://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses/1669>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by TopSCHOLAR®. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses & Specialist Projects by an authorized administrator of TopSCHOLAR®. For more information, please contact topscholar@wku.edu.

A NEW MEASURE OF
MATURE RELIGIOSITY

A Thesis
Presented to
the Faculty of the Department of Psychology
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, Kentucky

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirement for the Degree
Master of Arts

by
James A. Croxton

May 1986

AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF THESIS

Permission is hereby

- ☒ granted to the Western Kentucky University Library to make, or allow to be made photocopies, microfilm or other copies of this thesis for appropriate research or scholarly purposes.
- ☐ reserved to the author for the making of any copies of this thesis except for brief sections for research or scholarly purposes.

Signed James A. Croth

Date 5-8-86

Please place an "X" in the appropriate box.

This form will be filed with the original of the thesis and will control future use of the thesis.

A NEW MEASURE OF
MATURE RELIGIOSITY

Recommended 4/28/86

Sam B. McFarland
Committee Chairperson

Elsie J. Dotson

John O'Connor

Approved May 7, 1986

Thomas Gray
Dean of the Graduate College

Acknowledgements

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the members of my committee: Dr. Elsie Dotson, Dr. John O'Conner, and Dr. Sam McFarland. Their comments and suggestions were very valuable in the completion of this project. I wish to give a special thank-you to Dr. Sam McFarland, thesis chairman. Without his help and extra time devoted to this work, it would never have been completed.

Special thanks also goes to my wife, Lynne. Her encouragement, patience, and hard work made completion a reality.

Table of Contents

	Page
Acknowledgements	iii
List of Tables	v
Abstract	vi
Chapter	
I. Introduction	1
II. Literature Review	4
III. Methodology	19
IV. Results	24
Correlations with Religion Scales	26
Correlations with Personality Scales	27
V. Discussion of Results	28
Correlations with Religion Scales	29
Correlations with Personality Scales	30
Comparison Between the New Definition and the Seven First Order Factors	32
Summary	34
References	35
Appendices	37
Appendix A: Religious Attitude Inventory- Original	38
Appendix B: Religious Attitude Inventory- Revised	43
Appendix C: Religious Status Interview	46

List of Tables

Table 1:	Items and Factor Loadings on Seven First Order Factors	48
Table 2:	First Order Factor Loadings on Second Order Factors	49
Table 3:	Pearson Correlation Coefficients between Second Order Factors and Religion Scales . .	50
Table 4:	Pearson Correlation Coefficients between First Order Factors and Religion Scales . .	57
Table 5:	Pearson Correlation Coefficients between Second Order Factors and Personality Scales .	58
Table 6:	Pearson Correlation Coefficients between First Order Factors and Personality Scales .	59
Table 7:	First Order Factor Correlations	60
Table 8:	Alphas of First Order Factors	61
Table 9:	Relationship of Components with Individual Scale Items	62

A New Measure of
Mature Religiosity

James A. Croxton January, 1986 pages

Directed by: S. McFarland, E. Dotson, and J O'Connor

Department of Psychology Western Kentucky University

In this study, a new measure of mature religiosity was created. One hundred and fifty students were administered an 80 item scale based upon a consensus meaning of mature religiosity. The results of this administration were factor analyzed. Seven First Order Factors and two Second Order Factors emerged which could be adequately assessed by 50 of the 80 items. The revised 50 item scale was administered to 130 students. During the same administration, the students also responded to measures of personal maturity (Dogmatism Scale, Internal-External Locus of Control Scale, Social Desirability Scale) and other measures of mature religiosity (Intrinsic-Extrinsic Religious Orientation Scale, Interactional Scale from the Religious Life Inventory). One factor was found to overlap with the Intrinsic Religious Orientation Scale. It is also related to both the Interactional Scale and the Extrinsic Religious Orientation Scale, but the correlation was not enough to indicate duplication of those scales. The new scale was also found to be correlated with the

Internal-External Locus of Control Scale, the Social Desirability Scale, and to be negatively correlated with the Dogmatism Scale.

CHAPTER I

Introduction

In this thesis, the aim is to create a reliable and valid measure of mature religiosity. From a study of the available literature, it appears that nearly all current measures of religiosity either measure only specific dimensions of religiosity (church attendance, orthodoxy, fundamentalism) or only partially reflect the maturity dimension we are seeking (the measures of intrinsic religiosity and religion as quest are the principle examples).

Perhaps the measure most widely used is Allport's Intrinsic-Extrinsic Religious Orientation Scale, which reportedly has successfully differentiated between intrinsically and extrinsically oriented religious people (Robinson & Shuler, 1973). However, even Allport's measure described intrinsically religious people by asking about church attendance or time spent in meditation, as well as the degree to which one's daily living is based upon more personal beliefs. It appears that Allport was only trying to differentiate between the intrinsic and extrinsic groups, not create a measure of religiosity that would cover even his own six part definition of "mature religious sentiment" (Allport, 1950) to be described in a later section. Batson and Prince (1982) have also argued that

Allport did not measure mature religiosity with the Intrinsic Religion component of his Intrinsic-Extrinsic Religious Orientation Scale. They feel that Allport, in developing the intrinsic scale, omitted three components of "mature religious sentiment." Those three components are (1) integration of changing cultural mores and new scientific knowledge into one's religious beliefs without over simplifying either, (2) the perception that religious doubts are positive, and (3) openness to change in one's religious beliefs.

In short, the various measures of religion do not provide a comprehensive measure of mature religion. A new scale is here proposed to fill the void. This proposed scale uses a definition of mature religion which is based on the common features of definitions offered by recent psychologists of religion.

A valid scale of mature religiosity can have practical as well as theoretical uses. As Allport has observed, we cannot separate the individual from his spiritual beliefs (Allport, 1950). When therapists treat individuals with deep religious commitment, it could prove helpful to determine the maturity of their religion. The therapist cannot separate the individual, his or her personal progress, and his or her personal development from that person's religious belief system. Of course, those therapists who believe that all religion is unhealthy will not find use in this tool. However, those counselors and

researchers who have their own religious beliefs, and those who recognize religion as an actual need of an individual, may find the measure helpful.

CHAPTER II

Literature Review

Toward a Definition of Mature Religion

To reach a definition of mature religiosity--and thus have a basis for creation of the new measure--the most prominent definitions of mature religion presented by psychologists of religion will be reviewed. Commonalities and differences among these definitions will be noted in order to arrive at a working definition of mature religion--one which will hopefully have some quality of consensus.

Fowler

In Stages of Faith, James W. Fowler (1981) describes what he labels "the six stages of faith." Stage six, universalizing faith, represents "mature faith." He describes stage six as "exceedingly rare" (p. 200) and cites as examples such rare persons as Ghandi, Martin Luther King, and Mother Theresa. Since so few individuals reach this extreme on Fowler's continuum, a step back to stage five, conjunctive faith, may be more helpful. Of stage five Fowler says, "I feel I cannot communicate this stage clearly," but he believes that it "does exist" and "it is complex" (Fowler, 1979, p. 184). Fowler identifies the following features of stage five.

1. One with conjunctive faith does not dichotomize either/or but can see both sides of a religious issue. This person is aware that there are gray areas to truth--that not all issues are black and white.
2. One with this type of faith recognizes the task of reconciling the conscious and the unconscious. He/she brings together those needs and desires buried in the unconscious with the realities of the conscious world, personal limitations and personal restrictions.
3. One with conjunctive faith recognizes truth as multidimensional, recognizing that one's own tradition and doctrine are limited by one's culture and cultured experience of God, making that experience partial and unidimensional. Therefore, one in stage five is open to dialogue with those of other beliefs. Since an individual's beliefs are formed by one's culture it follows that even one's religious beliefs are tainted by that culture's beliefs. An individual with conjunctive faith recognizes this limited experience as well as the need to explore beyond one's own experience to sample the beliefs of those outside his/her own culture.
4. A person with conjunctive faith is able to look critically at his/her own beliefs and to examine those beliefs from the information and perspectives of

individuals outside one's own faith. The process includes examining new information to see whether it may require replacing old beliefs.

5. One with conjunctive faith accepts paradox and the truth that exists in apparent contradictions. He or she realizes that two opposing ideas may hold truth at the same time. The person realizes that two contradicting religious viewpoints may each serve the individual who holds them and may each hold truth for that individual.
6. One with conjunctive faith is open to ideas different from one's own beliefs, even if they challenge the current belief system. Such faith is not threatened by new ideas but uses them to test and strengthen one's faith. These new ideas may bring change in how an individual uses one's faith to relate to one's God while not changing the underlying faith in one's God. New ideas are viewed as opportunities for growth; they are not feared as destructive.
7. One with conjunctive faith is not confined by the beliefs of tribe, class, religious community, or nation. He or she is individual and independent, rather than following the directions of others.
8. One with such faith is concerned with generating identity and meaning for others. He or she shares with others in order to aid in their personal growth.

9. It is possible for an individual in stage five to withdraw and become cynical because of his or her understanding that truth may be paradoxical. Realizing that absolute answers do not always exist, that there is not always a final indisputable truth, the individual may quit re-evaluating one's own beliefs. One may see no need to search if one feels there is no final answer.

Allport

In The Individual and His Religion, Allport (1950) describes the development from the "Religion of Youth" to the "Religion of Maturity." He describes the "mature religious sentiment" (p. 64) as including six factors which separate it from an immature religious sentiment.

1. Mature sentiment is "well differentiated" (p. 64). That is, it is complex and grows out of a long and continuous process of examination, refinement, and reorganization.
2. Mature sentiment is "dynamic" (p. 65) despite being derivative--that is, beliefs are open to change, as one gains new experience. Growth takes place. New beliefs are added, old beliefs are elaborated, and outmoded beliefs are dropped. All the while, there remains a constant source from which the mature sentiment is derived. For the individual in the Judeo-Christian tradition, God remains a constant while one's understanding of God is constantly changing.

3. Mature religious sentiment leads to a consistent morality. One with mature religious sentiment is capable of handling moral and ethical conflicts in a way that allows the individual to be consistent without being rigid. Mature faith provides a coherence, which allows one to judge issues and to act with a consistent, but undogmatic, morality. A central theme of this morality is an active concern for other people. Mature sentiment includes reaching out to help others.
4. Mature religious sentiment is comprehensive in nature. That is, the individual's entire life is centered upon his or her religious beliefs. This mature sentiment leads to a unified lifestyle and brings an order to the life of the individual. Amid the confusion of day-to-day decision-making there is a set of values or beliefs which provides consistent direction to all of one's activities.
5. Mature sentiment is integral. That is, mature religion can forge a synthesis between religious values, the demands of modern life, and the findings of science. Mature sentiment is open to changing cultural mores and to new scientific knowledge, and is able to unite these aspects of modern living with a code of consistent religious values.
6. Mature religious sentiment is heuristic. It is a working hypothesis, a belief that is held until

a more comprehensive understanding is attained. One with this sentiment realizes that one can have faith and doubts at the same time. In fact, it is beneficial to hold onto a belief until a more encompassing belief system reveals itself. When it does, then the old belief may become incorporated in the belief system; but until the new belief is revealed, there is still a source of unity for one's life.

In short, one with mature sentiment is able to accept the strengths and the shortcomings of one's belief, realizing that the growth process for the belief is too complex to always offer answers. Since mature sentiment is open to critical thought, mature religious sentiment is always open to reorganization. The mature sentiment is neither defensive nor self-serving, but rather maintains itself through search for truth in order to better serve the source from which it is derived, which in the Judeo-Christian tradition would be God. Despite present doubt, it gives order to life and answers to many of life's questions.

Kao

Charles Kao, in Psychological and Religious Development: Maturity and Maturation, (1981) identifies three primary components which he sees as necessary for mature religion. He describes the three essential components of differentiation, integration, and spiritual transcendence as the "triune dynamism" (p. 59), and the

three are interrelated. Kao feels that these components are essential for all maturity -- personal, intellectual, or spiritual. For our purposes, however, we shall describe the dynamism that Kao outlines as essential for mature religion.

1. Differentiation is the process of leaving simplistic beliefs to grow, to mature, and to develop more complex beliefs. An example is individuals who leave their parents. He or she leaves the primary support system so that personal growth can more fully develop. In spiritual terms, the individual transcends the simplicity of this world, "seeking the ultimate in and beyond this world" (p. 59). He or she leaves simple, concrete concerns to explore abstract questions, such as meaning and purpose.
2. Integration is the process of reentering that which one left behind. The differentiated person will return to his or her parents when adulthood is reached, but as an independent person. In religious terms, one must return to the reality from which one has left to become differentiated. However, as the individual reenters, one enters as a more mature spiritual person.
3. Spiritual transcendence is the process of liberating oneself from egocentricity and moving toward self-objectification. Transcendence involves "asking about (one's own) asking" and "thinking about (one's own) thinking" (Kao, 1981, p. 59). Transcendence can

create restlessness and inner tension and bring about imbalance. Transcendence often creates higher levels of integration and differentiation, thereby creating more advanced levels of religious experiences.

Kao appears to describe a process by which individuals mature through experience. The experience includes all three of Kao's principles. Each new experience gives one the spiritual maturity to move on to the next experience. What one learns from an experience may greatly determine what one learns from future experiences. Growth may come in spurts or in more constant movement, but the primary principle in Kao's definition is the "process of becoming" (Kao, 1981, p. 330) while one strives to reach greater perfection.

Von Komm

Adrian Von Komm, in Religion and Personality (1968) has described what he labels as the "characteristics of the perfect religious personality" (Von Komm, 1968, p.98) Von Komm describes this perfect personality as recognizing one's unique individuality and the meaning of one's life while acknowledging that this individuality is always developing. The perfect personality is receptive to this development. One is not imprisoned in the events of the past but works on a more existential level, even as one works toward self-development in the "constant readiness to respond fully to the demands of reality" (p. 101). This includes being aware of one's particular reality as well as

implying full development of talents and potentials. However, the perfect personality will not put constant and total effort into developing potentials if others may suffer. For example, the talented young mother may not devote all of her time to her art if her children will suffer as a result. In short, Von Komm feels the perfect religious personality learns from the past but is not tied to it. While concerning oneself with present events, this perfect religious personality gains new awareness and continues self-development. The perfect personality is aware of its individual talents and wishes them to develop during the process of growing.

Fromm

Eric Fromm, in Psychoanalysis and Religion (1950), postulates that in every man there is a religion. Fromm states that the question is not "religion or not" but "what kind of religion" (p. 26). Fromm describes two primary types. "Authoritarian religion" controls people through irrational laws and dictates. It therefore paralyzes man's development. Fromm asserts that "authoritarian religion" is not helpful to man because it emphasizes the sublimation of man's powers of reason and love to some higher authority. "Humanistic religion", however, is "centered around man and his strengths" (p. 36); this religion, therefore, furthers man's development. "Not fear and submission but love and the assertion of one's own powers

are the basis of mystical experience. God is not a symbol of power over man but of man's own power" (p. 35).

"Humanistic religion" encourages mankind to use his powers of reason and love to fulfill his potential. Fromm goes on to say that these two opposing ideas can be found within each on the world's religions.

Orlo Strunk Jr. (1965) further examines Fromm's comparison of authoritarian and humanistic religion. Strunk says Fromm sees religion based upon reason as mature while religion based on childhood wishes is immature. Humanistic orientations which further development of man's powers of reason, love, and productive work must be closest to the truth, while authoritarian orientations, being derived from other people, intimidate individual freedom. Strunk also presents seven characteristics of Fromm's humanistic religion orientation.

1. "Humanistic religion" places emphasis on reason and the use of reason in developing beliefs. There is no blind, unquestioning allegiance.
 2. God is a symbol of man's own power, not a symbol of external power and force.
 3. People possessing this belief love their fellowman as they love themselves.
 4. Humanistic religion emphasizes the individual serving the religion or the source of the religion.
- Humanistic religion is productive rather than

exploitive. It emphasizes the individual performing rather than simply receiving.

5. An individual with humanistic beliefs possesses a deep and continuous humility. Aware that he or she can know nothing about the actual true nature of God, one is slow to judge the religion of another.
6. Such an individual is filled with wonder over existence as well as one's place in this existence. This person is also concerned with questions about the ultimate meaning of life.
7. An individual with humanistic religion desires and works to become related to and share responsibility for the universe while remaining aware of his or her own unique individuality.

Strunk

Strunk (1965) also presents his own definition of mature religion. He states it as "characterized by profound experiences of mystical oneness" (Strunk, 1965, p. 105). It is authoritative, resulting in feelings of wonder, elation, and freedom. Mature religion forms out of experience; it is not just something one simply thinks about. Strunk states his nine criteria for mature religion as the following.

1. Childhood religion must be purged. Mature religion arises from growth and resulting complexity, though some childhood beliefs may be retained.

2. A person with mature religious beliefs is involved with the world around himself or herself. He or she is aware of problems and people and concerned about them.
3. There exists a degree of understanding of the historical roots of one's own religion and the psychological needs that the religion meets. One must appreciate the power of the hidden forces of the psyche, understanding that one's religion is not simply a set of doctrines, but is the collection and culmination of complex emotional and spiritual interactions. One understands that one's beliefs are strongly influenced by one's own background and personal psychological processes.
4. One with mature religion recognizes that unconscious forces exist. One may not fully understand the forces or their source, but he or she is aware that they are present and that one must deal with them.
5. Mature religion includes some kind of belief in a source greater than one's self.
6. Mature religion is comprehensive in that it integrates scientific and philosophical truth with religious faith during the search for meaning. As the individual processes the integration of science and philosophy, he or she must be open to answers and perspectives not yet envisioned. Since a search for meaning and an integration process are occurring, mature religion

will be arrived at with careful reasoning. Easy answers to complex questions will be spurned by a mature search.

7. One's works are consistent with one's faith.
8. Love is comprehensive in life. Productivity, humility, and responsibility are natural signs of this love.
9. An active commitment exists. Mature religion is saved from fanaticism and bigotry by critical tentativeness. The individual is devoted, though doubt continues to exist (Strunk, 1965).

Summary

From a close examination of these definitions, several commonalities are apparent. The following summary of the definitions became the basis for the proposed measure of mature religiosity.

1. Mature religion is open to change that facilitates growth. Development and growth arise from critical review, constant examination and reorganization. Mature religion does not diminish human thought and capacity.
2. Mature religion is complex, realizing that there are not always simple answers and simple solutions. Fowler described it as the ability to see the gray areas; to realize that not all issues can be simplified to black and white viewpoints.
3. Mature religion includes love for others. It cannot be self-centered. It is concerned with needs beyond

itself, the needs of other people. This love for others is an active love.

4. This active love includes an active commitment of service to people. Concern for other people leads to doing for others.
5. For mature religion then, faith and works are consistent. A person behaves and makes decisions based upon one's religious beliefs. These beliefs, then encourage a consistent yet flexible morality.
6. Mature religion is comprehensive. It directs the person's entire life, his/her beliefs, thoughts, actions, and moral decisions.
7. Mature religion helps an individual integrate one's beliefs with science, societal norms and the realities around him/her. The openness of mature religion allows the individual to process varying beliefs from different sources and integrate them, rather than deny information from the varying sources.
8. Important to integration is that an individual understands the psychological and historical roots of one's own beliefs. Mature religion then requires self-objectification so that an individual can understand why one believes as one does, and why a change in beliefs may increase his/her understanding of oneself and one's religion.

From these eight major components, a measure which can differentiate between mature and immature religion was created.

CHAPTER III

Methodology

A scale (Appendix A) consisting of 80 items was created. The 80 items were based upon the components of the previously mentioned attributes. Approximately 10 items were written to measure each component. Half of the items were worded negatively, half were worded positively. For example, component three states mature religion includes love for others. One positively worded item used to detect that attitude is "I put the needs of others equal to my own needs" (Item No. 17). A negatively worded item is "I don't worry about others as long as my needs are met" (Item No. 15). Component six states that mature religion is comprehensive. A positively worded item used to measure that attitude is "My religious beliefs define my moral beliefs" (Item No. 27). A negatively worded item is "Religion has little influence on my daily decisions" (Item No. 11). Item responses were recorded on a six-point Likert scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." A single item scale rating the importance of religion was also included (How important is your religion to you?). This single item has been shown to discriminate between those professing religious beliefs and those professing no religious beliefs at all (Gorsuch and McFarland, 1972).

Subjects and Procedures

In order to reduce the number of items and for an initial test of reliability of the instrument, the scale was administered to a group of 150 college students in Introduction to Psychology courses. Answer sheets of those students reporting to not be religious at all were removed and not included in analyses. Very incomplete answer sheets were also removed. One hundred twenty-five response sheets remained and were evaluated. In the initial analysis, the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) (Hull & Nie, 1981) was used to obtain inter-item correlations, item variances and standard deviations. Using the Gorsuch model (Gorsuch, 1974), a series of factor analyses of the scale was conducted to determine the empirical factor structure of the items. Gorsuch's method for determining the proper number of factors included (a) extracting those factors which accounted for non-trivial variance and (b) extracting factors which were theoretically meaningful. The "scree" test was used to estimate the proper number of factors (i.e., using the minimum amount of factors to account for the maximum amount of variance.)

Gorsuch (1974) also presented a five step procedure to help determine the proper number of factors in those cases where break off points were not clear-cut. These five steps were used in this factor analysis: (a) compute a factor analysis with no specified number of factors,

(b) examine the resulting factors for trivial factors, (c) delete the trivial factors from the total of factors resulting from the first step, (d) rerun the factor analysis using the specified number of factors resulting from the third step, and (e) examine this new analysis for trivial factors and adjust again if trivial factors are still present. In addition, factors were rotated to varimax solution. A coefficient alpha was calculated for each of the final factors.

On the basis of the factor analysis several items were eliminated resulting in a shorter scale. Most of the eliminated items loaded substantially on the first factors but proved unnecessary in accounting for non-trivial variance. The new scale, consisting of 50 items, was then administered to a new group of 150 college students. Again, answer sheets of students professing no religion at all and incomplete answer sheets were removed, leaving 108 response sheets.

At the same time, the following two religion scales were administered to the same students: the Intrinsic-Extrinsic Religious Orientation Scale (Feagin, 1964) and the Interactional Scale from the Religious Life Inventory (Batson & Ventis, 1982), also known as Religion as Quest (Batson, 1976). These religion scales were chosen because they purport to measure components of religious maturity similar to those described by the scale developed for this thesis. The Intrinsic-Extrinsic Religious

Orientation Scale purports to differentiate between those who see religion as a means to other ends, such as happiness and social approval (extrinsic), and those who hold religious beliefs that are more mature, more internalized, and more central to daily living (intrinsic). A good example of an intrinsic orientation item is "I try hard to carry my religion into all my other decisions in life." An example of an extrinsic item is "The church is most important to me as a place to formulate good social relationships." The Religion as Quest Scale purports to describe an aspect of religion based upon the need to grow, learn, and mature. An example is "When it comes to religious questions, I feel driven to know the truth." In establishing convergent and differential validity, it is these scales that have the greatest likelihood of measuring the same dimensions as the new scale described in this study.

To aid in establishing construct validity, the following personality scales were also administered: the Dogmatism Scale (Rokeach, 1954), the Social Desirability Scale (Crown and Marlowe, 1964), and the Internal-External Locus of Control Scale (Rotter, 1966). SPSS (Hull et al., 1981) was again used to evaluate results. These personality scales were chosen because they measure a cross section of traits which are related to personal maturity--traits that either indicate personal control (locus of control), indicate rigidity rather than

flexibility and openness (dogmatism), or indicate a willingness not to conform to socially acceptable responses (social desirability).

Personal maturity measures were compared to the new measure because it was assumed that there would be some correlation between personal maturity and mature religiosity. This assumption is explicit in the writings of Fowler, Kao, Fowler, and Fromm and generally implied in the theories of the other psychologists reviewed in this study. The personality scales used here did not define all aspects of personal maturity but, as an initial test of the new scale, they covered a variety of aspects of personal maturity.

Factor analysis of the measure of mature religiosity described here was obtained as well as inter-item correlations and standard deviations on the remaining items. The former factors were retained, and reliability coefficients on the new administration were obtained for those former factors. Internal consistency and inter-factor correlations were obtained for the former factors. The last step was to derive correlations between the scales. First order factors were compared to the other first order factors and to the second order factors. First and second order factors were compared to the six scale scores and the six scale scores were compared to one another.

CHAPTER IV

Results

The original reason for creating a new scale was to more closely define mature religiosity as it is described by the theorists reviewed in this thesis. In creating a new measure, however, it was necessary to establish reliability as well as show that the new scale differs from existing scales designed to measure the same or similar ideas.

In the initial administration and analysis, seven primary factors emerged. The seven factors, their highest loading positive items, and their coefficient Alphas for the factor scales were

- (1) Factor I - Values and Morals Based Upon Religious Beliefs, "My religious beliefs greatly influence my daily behavior," $\alpha = .93$.
- (2) Factor II - Closemindedness To, and Intolerance Of, Different Beliefs, "There is only one correct way to view even complex religious issues," $\alpha = .84$.
- (3) Factor III - Defensiveness of Beliefs, "Religious doubt is the work of Satan," $\alpha = .73$.
- (4) Factor IV - Rigidity in Beliefs, "I have pretty much accepted my religious beliefs as they were taught me by my parents," $\alpha = .71$.

- (5) Factor V - Concern for the Needs of Others, "The needs of others are very important to me," $\alpha = .68$.
- (6) Factor VI - Openness to Change in Religious Beliefs that Comes with Growth and Maturity, "My religious beliefs may change in the future as I mature and learn," $\alpha = .59$.
- (7) Factor VII - Recognizing the Paradox in Truth, "There are always two way to look at religious issues," $\alpha = .63$.

Alphas and correlations between factors are reported in Tables 1 and 2. These factors were chosen using the method described by Gorsuch (1974) and discussed earlier in this thesis. The seven factors were then evaluated as to which of the 80 items were correlated with the factor. After this review (described in Methodology) thirty items were eliminated.

The new scale of 50 items was readministered to a new group of college students and reliability data were again reviewed. Factor loadings for this readministration are reported in Table 3. A second order factor analysis of these first order factors established two second order factors. Second Order Factor A was a Tolerance of Other's Beliefs and Openness to New Beliefs. First Order Factors II, III, VI, and VII comprised Second Order Factor A (Table 4). Second Order Factor B, comprised of Factors I, IV, and V, was defined as Importance of Religious Beliefs

as Basis for Values and Openness to Change in Those Beliefs (Table 4). Second Order Factors A and B were correlated at .44.

With the seven first order factors chosen, and two second order factors emergent, the following correlations were obtained: First Order Factors with Second Order Factors (Table 4), Second Order Factors with Religious Scales (Table 5), First Order Factors with Religious Scales (Table 6), Second Order Factors with Personality Scales (Table 7), and First Order Factors with Personality Scales (Table 8).

Correlations with Religious Scales

The results in Table 5 show that other than a strong correlation between Second Order Factor B and the Intrinsic Religious Orientation Scale, the new scale was not highly correlated with the other religious scales. Second Order Factor A had a slightly significant correlation with the Intrinsic Religious Orientation Scale (Feagin, 1964), $r = .30$, and the Interactional Religion Scale (Batson et al., 1982), $r = .39$. Second Order Factor B had a strongly significant correlation with the Intrinsic Religious Orientation Scale, $r = -.67$.

The correlation between the first order factors and the other religion scales are reported in Table 6. The Intrinsic Religious Orientation Scale had a strongly significant correlation with Factor I (Values and Morals Based Upon Religious Beliefs), $r = -.70$, and Factor V

(Concern for Others), $r = -.41$. The Intrinsic Religious Orientation Scale was also correlated with Factors II (Close-mindedness and Intolerance), $r = .25$, and IV (Defensiveness), $r = .29$. Factor II (Close-mindedness and Intolerance) was significantly correlated with the Interactional Scale, $r = .39$. Factors IV (Rigidity in Beliefs) and VII (Recognizing Paradox in Truth) had slightly significant correlations with the Extrinsic Religious Orientation Scale and the Interactional Scale.

Correlations with Personality Scales

In general, as anticipated, the personality scales showed mild correlations with the new religious maturity scale. As seen in Table 7, Second Order Factor B had a significant negative correlation with the Locus of Control Scale, $r = -.32$, and a significant positive correlation with the Social Desirability Scale, $r = .35$. Second Order Factor A had a significant negative correlation with the Dogmatism Scale, $r = -.27$.

As seen in Table 8, the Locus of Control Scale had significant negative correlations with Factors I (Values and Morals Based Upon Religious Beliefs), $r = -.28$, and V (Concern for Others), $r = -.28$. Factor V also had a significant negative correlation with the Social Desirability Scale, $r = -.46$. The Dogmatism Scale had significant negative correlations with Factors III (Defensiveness), $r = -.37$, and IV (Rigidity), $r = -.23$.

CHAPTER V

Discussion of Results

The results of this study suggest that the scale described in this thesis taps dimensions of mature religiosity not covered by other measures. Those new dimensions appear to be the same dimensions defined earlier in this paper and described by the same primary factors derived through statistical analysis. As previously asserted herein, other measures of mature religion generally use the adherence to traditional religious practices to measure mature religion. The earlier authors presented here defined mature religion in terms of attitude and actions (i.e. concern for others, active love, openness to change, acceptance of doubt, tolerance of others beliefs). Factor analysis of a measure based upon that definition has produced a scale that measures those components. Herein lies the uniqueness of this new scale. This scale measures mature religiosity in terms of attitude, belief, and actions. Those ideas of open-mindedness, tolerance, and concern for others are the basis of the new scale, not the following of traditional religious practices. Previous scales have apparently not tapped those dimensions. The advantages to defining the new dimensions are having a way to measure mature religiosity

as defined earlier. The new measure will be of particular interest to the clinician or reasearcher who wishes to measure mature religiosity as an attitude and belief system, rather than as following a set of orthodox practices.

Correlations with Religious Scales

Second Order Factor B and First Order Factor I appear to be measuring the same dimension as, or dimensions very similar to, the Intrinsic Religious Orientation Scale (Tables 5 and 6). On the Intrinsic Scale, a higher score indicates a less intrinsic orientation, suggesting that someone with a more intrinsic religious orientation will also score high on Second Order Factor B and First Order Factor I of the measure described earlier. There results are not surprising, since the Intrinsic Scale was developed by one of the authors whose ideas were used in this thesis to help define mature religiosity, Gordon Allport (1967). Second Order Factor A and First Order Factors II, VI, and VII were mildly related to the Religion as Quest Scale, suggesting that someone scoring high on Religion as Quest would also score high on the measure described in this thesis. However, these other correlations are not high enough to indicate duplication of previous measures of religion. They represent unique dimensions measured by the new scale not previously measured by psychologists of religion. Those unique dimensions appear to be

- (1) Close mindedness toward different religious beliefs
(Factor I),
- (2) Defensiveness of one's own religious beliefs
(Factor II),
- (3) A rigidity in one's beliefs (Factor III),
- (4) Openness to change in religious beliefs (Factor IV),
and
- (5) Recognition of paradox in truth in religious beliefs
(Factor V).

Correlation with Personality Scales

The results indicated that, as expected, one scoring high on measures of personal maturity also scored high on the new measure of mature religiosity. The significant negative correlation between Second Order Factor B and Locus of Control (Rotter, 1966) suggests that someone high in internal locus of control is more likely to achieve a higher score on Factor 1, Values and Morals Based Upon Religious Beliefs. This outcome is expected since internal locus of control suggests maturity. Since Factors I (Values and Morals Based Upon Religious Beliefs) and V (Concern for Others) comprise Second Order Factor B, it is clear that they are negatively correlated with the Locus of Control Scale for the same reason as Factor B. The significant correlation between Second Order Factor B and Social Desirability (Crown, et al., 1964) indicates that there is a tendency for those giving socially desirable responses to score higher on the new scale. Though there

was a significant correlation between Second Order Factor B and both the Social Desirability Scale and the Internal Locus of Control Scale, it was noted that the correlation between the Social Desirability Scale and the Internal Locus of Control Scale was $r = .22$. This difference indicates that the correlations between those personality scales and Factor B are independent correlations and not reflecting some overlap of a personal maturity dimension. Second Order Factor B had a significant negative correlation with the Dogmatism Scale (Rokeach, 1954). This relationship reflects the significant negative correlation between First Order Factors III (Defensiveness) and IV (Rigidity), (which load on Factor B) and dogmatism. The negative correlation resulted because both Factors III and IV are heavily loaded with negatively worded items. Negatively worded items were reverse scored. High scores are turned into low scores. Low scores on Factors III (Defensiveness) and IV (Rigidity) represent rigidity. A high score on Dogmatism represents a more dogmatic orientation; thus as scores on Factors III and IV go down, scores on Dogmatism would go up. This finding suggests that, as expected, more dogmatic individuals will be defensive of their beliefs and resistant to doubt. Also, as expected, more dogmatic individuals will not score highly on this new measure of mature religiosity.

Comparison Between the New Definition
and the Seven First Order Factors

At the beginning of this thesis was with an eight part definition of mature religiosity:

1. Openness to change that facilitates growth.
2. Realization of complexity (gray areas) in religion.
3. Love for others, not self-centeredness.
4. Active commitment of service to others.
5. Faith and works are consistent.
6. Mature religion is comprehensive, directing the person's entire life.
7. Integration of religion with science, societal norms, and reality through the process of evaluating beliefs different from one's own.
8. Realization of the psychological and historical roots of one's religion and how that realization increases one's understanding of one's own religious beliefs.

Factor analysis of student responses yielded seven factors that differentiate people on the basis of religiosity.

- I. Values and Morals Based Upon Religious Beliefs.
- II. Intolerance of Different Beliefs.
- III. Defensiveness of Beliefs.
- IV. Rigidity in Beliefs.
- V. Concern for the Needs of Others.
- VI. Openness to Change in Religious Beliefs.
- VII. Recognizing the Paradox in Truth.

As expected, there is much overlap between these two lists. Openness to change, the first component of the definition, is represented by Factor II (Intolerance of Different Beliefs), Factor III (Defensiveness of Beliefs), Factor IV (Rigidity in Beliefs), and Factor VI (Openness to Change in Religious Beliefs). Component 2, Realization of the complexity of religious beliefs, is represented by Factor VII (Recognizing the Paradox in Truth). Component 3, Love for others, and Component 4, Active commitment, are represented by Factor V (Concern for the Needs of Others). Component 5, Faith and works are consistent, and Component 6, Mature religion is comprehensive, are represented by Factor V as well as Factor I (Values and Morals Based upon Religious Beliefs). Component 7, Integration of beliefs with other differing beliefs, is represented by Factors II (Intolerance of Different Beliefs), III (Defensiveness of Beliefs), IV (Rigidity in Beliefs), and VI (Openness to Change in Religious Beliefs). Component 8, Understanding the roots of one's religion and how that realization increases one's understanding, is also represented by Factors II (Intolerance of Different Beliefs), III (Defensiveness of Beliefs), IV (Rigidity in Beliefs), and VI (Openness to Change in Religious Beliefs). Clearly, all eight of the components of the original component are used, and all seven First-Order Factors are related to one of these eight components. In addition it is evident that

these eight components can be identified with those scale items which describe that component. Table 9 demonstrated that relationship.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to create a new measure of mature religiosity, a measure based upon actions and values rather than following traditional religious practices. The new measure was based upon the commonalities of definitions of six authors who have offered their own definitions of mature religiosity.

In order to create this measure, it was first demonstrated that the new scale created to measure the new definition contained seven primary factors.

Comparison with other religious scales indicated that the new scale measures dimensions different from those other scales. Although there is some overlap with the Intrinsic Religious Orientation Scale, the new scale appears to measure some unique dimensions not covered by those other scales. Comparison with personality scales indicated a relationship between personal maturity and a high score on this new measure of mature religiosity.

Since the population studied was limited to college students, care must be taken in generalizing from results. However, the findings do indicate that the ground work has been laid in establishing a new measure of mature religiosity.

References

- Allport, G. (1950). The Individual and His Religion. New York: McMillan Publishing Co., Inc.
- Batson, C. D. (1976). Religion as Prosocial: Agent of double agent. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 15.
- Batson, C. D. and Prince, L. (1983). Religious orientation and complexity of thought about existential concerns. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 22, 35-50.
- Batson, C. D. & Ventis, W. L. (1982). The Religious experience: A social-psychological perspective. New York: Oxford Press.
- Crown, D. & Marlowe, D. (1964). The Approval Motive. New York: Wiley.
- Feagin, J. (1964). Prejudice and Religious Types: A focused study of southern fundamentalists. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 4, 3-13.
- Fowler, J. (1979). Stages of Faith: The Psychology of Human Development and the Quest for Meaning. San Francisco: Harper and Row.
- Fromm, E. (1950). Psychoanalysis and Religion. New York: Bantam Books.
- Gorsuch, R. L. (1974). Factor Analysis. Philadelphia: W. B. Samders.
- Gorsuch, R. L. & McFarland, S. G. (1972). Single vs. multiple item scale for measuring religious values. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 2, 53-64.
- Hull, C. H. & Nie, N. H. (Eds.). (1981). SPSS Update 7-9. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Kao, C. (1981). Psychological and Religious Development: Maturity and Maturation. Washington D.C.: University Press of America.
- Rokeach, M. (1954). The nature and meaning of dogmatism. Psychological Review, 61, 194-204.

- Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 80.
- Strunk, O. (1965). Mature Religion: A Psychological Study. New York: Abingdon Press.
- Van Korm, A. (1968). Religion and Personality. New York: Image Books.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Religious Attitude Inventory

Directions: Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements using the scale described on the answer sheet.

1. My religious beliefs influence most of my decisions in life.
2. I have often reexamined my religious beliefs.
3. My daily moral and ethical decisions are based upon my religious beliefs.
4. Religion can learn much from science.
5. My religious beliefs may change in the future as I mature and learn.
6. There are a number of religious questions that are difficult for me to answer.
7. I hold my religious beliefs because they appeal to me emotionally.
8. There is only one correct way to view even complex religious questions.
9. I do not consider my religious beliefs when I make decisions.
10. My religion is more to help me in my personal life than it is to answer great abstract questions.
11. My understanding of God is the true one.
12. Religious doubts are as important for personal growth as are religious beliefs.
13. Some religious issues are not solved with one, infallible answer.
14. Sometimes I get frustrated when I can't convince others that my religious beliefs are true.
15. Science and religion can learn from one another.
16. My religious beliefs have greatly influenced the development of my value (belief) system.

17. Religious doubt is harmful to faith.
18. My spiritual beliefs explain the reason for existence.
19. Different beliefs on the same religious issue may both hold truth.
20. Religion has little influence on my daily decisions.
21. I prefer not to read articles or books which cast doubt on my religious beliefs.
22. My religious beliefs are open to change.
23. There are always two ways to look at religious issues.
24. Christianity and Hinduism may both hold religious truths.
25. I don't worry about others as long as my needs are met.
26. I worship because I want to, not out of guilt.
27. I believe what I've been taught about God and that is good enough for me.
28. It is better for a person's religious beliefs be firm and free of doubt.
29. I arrived at my current beliefs through much thought and questioning.
30. I put the needs of others equal with my own needs.
31. My church's concept of God is the correct one.
32. Doubt is the opposite of religious faith.
33. Some religious issues are not understood through simple, concrete answers.
34. There may exist a set of religious beliefs superior to my own.
35. Mature faith does not need thought and reflection.
36. Although I don't always agree with the religious beliefs of others, their beliefs may be as true as my own.
37. Since my religious belief are right, there is no reason to expect them to change.

38. I have pretty much accepted my religious beliefs as they were taught by my parents and/or church.
39. Religious doubt allows us to learn.
40. I do not like to have my religious beliefs criticized.
41. My personal religious belief may not be the only correct view of God.
42. My spiritual beliefs are the source of my motivation in life.
43. My religious beliefs define my moral beliefs
44. Religion and science don't have to conflict.
45. Most of my moral decisions are based upon by religious beliefs.
46. I generally put my needs above the needs of others.
47. I have tried to evaluate the religion (or lack of religion) my parents taught me in a fair and objective way.
48. I often sacrifice for the benefit of others.
49. I am virtually certain that my religious beliefs will always remain what they are today.
50. Religious doubt is the work of Satan.
51. No one cares as much for others as they do themselves.
52. I often think about life's basic questions.
53. My daily actions are generally consistent with my religious beliefs.
54. A person could not ever develop mature religious beliefs without doubt and questioning.
55. Two differing viewpoints can both hold truth at the same time.
56. A conscientious person could earnestly study my religious beliefs with an open mind and find good reasons for rejecting them.
57. I can laugh at my own weaknesses and limitations in living up to my beliefs.
58. Religious doubt is healthy.

59. I have never really doubted that my religious beliefs are basically true.
60. I ask nothing from anyone and want no one to ask anything of me.
61. I don't let others stand in the way of my own happiness.
62. My religious beliefs are unimportant to my decision-making process.
63. There is always one correct answer to religious questions.
64. I do alot of things to benefit other people.
65. My religious beliefs are not determined by my personal and emotional needs.
66. My personal moral and value system is based upon my religious beliefs.
67. I got my present religious beliefs from my parents.
68. I get very defensive when I defend my religious beliefs.
69. Hopefully, as one matures, religious understandings change and grow.
70. There is not always a correct answer to every religious question.
71. Criticism of my religion is the work of Satan.
72. Money and what it can buy are my top priorities in life.
73. My faith is correct and therefore will not change.
74. The needs of other people are very important to me.
75. I care for other people as much as I care for myself.
76. My way of believing may not be the only correct way to believe.
77. My religious beliefs greatly influence my daily behavior.
78. My personal values are based upon my spiritual beliefs.

79. I believe the way I do because my church tells me it is the best way to believe.
80. Simple, concrete explanations are sufficient to explain any religious question.

Appendix B

Religious Attitude Inventory

Directions: Indicate how much you agree with each of the following statements using the scale described on the answer sheet.

1. I have often reexamined my religious beliefs.
2. My daily moral and ethical decisions are based upon my religious beliefs.
3. My religious beliefs may change in the future as I mature and learn.
4. I hold my religious beliefs because they appeal to me emotionally.
5. There is only one correct way to view even complex religious questions.
6. My religion is more to help me in my personal life than it is to answer great abstract questions.
7. My understanding of God is the true one.
8. Some religious issues are not solved with one, infallible answer.
9. My religious beliefs have greatly influenced the development of my value (belief) system.
10. Different beliefs on the same religious issue may both hold truth.
11. Religion has little influence on my daily decisions.
12. I prefer not to read articles or books which cast doubt on my religious beliefs.
13. My religious beliefs are open to change.
14. There are always two ways to look at religious issues.
15. I don't worry about others as long as my needs are met.
16. It is better for a person's religious beliefs to be firm and free of doubt.
17. I put the needs of others equal with my own needs.
18. My church's concept of God is the correct one.

19. Doubt is the opposite of religious faith.
20. Mature faith does not need thought and reflection.
21. Although I don't always agree with the religious beliefs of others, their beliefs may be as true as my own.
22. Since my religious beliefs are right, there is no reason to expect them to change.
23. I have pretty much accepted my religious beliefs as they were taught me by my parents and/or church.
24. Religious doubt allows us to learn.
25. I do not like to have my religious beliefs criticized.
26. My personal religious belief may not be the only correct view of God.
27. My religious beliefs define my moral beliefs.
28. Most of my moral decisions are based upon my religious beliefs.
29. I generally put my needs above the needs of others.
30. I am virtually certain that my religious beliefs will always remain what they are today.
31. Religious doubt is the work of Satan.
32. No one cares as much for others as they do themselves.
33. A person could not ever develop mature religious beliefs without doubt and questioning.
34. Two differing viewpoints can both hold truth at the same time.
35. I ask nothing from anyone and want no one to ask anything of me.
36. My religious beliefs are unimportant to my decision-making process.
37. My personal moral and value system is based upon my religious beliefs.
38. I got my present religious beliefs from my parents.
39. I get very defensive when I defend my religious beliefs.

40. Hopefully, as one matures, religious understandings change and grow.
41. Criticism of my religion is the work of Satan.
42. Money and what it can buy are my top priorities in life.
43. My faith is correct and therefore will not change.
44. The needs of other people are very important to me.
45. I care for other people as much as I care for myself.
46. My way of believing may not be the only correct way to believe.
47. My religious beliefs greatly influence my daily behavior.
48. My personal values are based upon my spiritual beliefs.
49. There is always one correct answer to religious questions.
50. I believe the way I do because my church tells me it is the best way to believe.

Appendix C

Fuller Theological Seminary has recently presented its own measure of religious maturity, The Religious Status Interview (APA, 1984). That work, and subsequent research on that scale, was received after analysis was completed on our new scale, but the scale and reasearch were exmained. Several differences were noted between that new scale and the measure described in this thesis. First, the Religious Status Interview uses an interview to obtain responses. The scale used structured interviews with standard questions to measure seven subscales. Although good inter-rater reliability was reported, there still exists that subjective scoring of the examiner. Second, it is probable that social desirability is more likely to influence responses in a face to face interview than on a pencil and paper test. Third, a pencil and paper test is more convenient for the clinician. Fourth, at least in the material Fuller furnished, there was no comparison made with other religious scales. Fifth, the scale doesn't purport to measure mature religiosity as defined by the scale described in this thesis. Rather the scale often used the following of traditional religious practices to measure mature religiosity, which is one of this thesis'criticisms of earlier scales.

TABLES

Table 1
First Order Factor Correlations

Factors	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	1.00						
2	-.20	1.00					
3	-.23	.47	1.00				
4	-.52	.37	.52	1.00			
5	.49	.06	-.06	-.32	1.00		
6	-.26	.59	.37	.41	-.03	1.00	
7	-.02	.68	.38	.21	.09	.55	1.00

(n = 108)

Table 2
Alphas of First Order Factors

Factor I	.93
Factor II	.84
Factor III	.73
Factor IV	.71
Factor V	.68
Factor VI	.59
Factor VII	.63

(n = 108)

Table 3A through 3G - Items and Factor Loadings on First
Order Factors

Table 3-A

Factor I Items with Factor Loadings

Factor I - Values and Morals Based upon Religious Beliefs

Item	Factor Loading
2. My daily moral and ethical decisions are based upon my religious beliefs.	.80
9. My religious beliefs have greatly influenced the development of my value (belief) system.	.79
11. Religion has little influence on my daily decisions.	-.74
27. My religious beliefs define my moral beliefs.	.76
28. Most of my moral decisions are based upon my religious beliefs.	.76
37. My personal moral and value system is based upon my religious beliefs.	.80
47. My religious beliefs greatly influence my daily behavior.	.89
48. My personal values are based upon my spiritual beliefs.	.84

(n = 108)

Table 3-B

Factor II Items with Factor Loadings

Factor II - Close-mindedness to and Intolerance of
Different Beliefs

Items	Factor Loadings
5. There is only one correct way to view even complex religious questions.	.66
10. Different beliefs on the same religious issue my both hold truth.	-.56
21. Although I don't always agree with the religious beliefs of others, their beliefs may be as true as my own.	-.68
22. Since my religious beliefs are right, there is no reason to expect them to change.	.51
26. My personal religious belief may not be the only correct view of God.	-.53
34. Two differing viewpoints can both hold truth at the same time.	.56
43. My faith is correct and therefore will not change.	.54
46. My way of believing may not be the only correct way to believe.	-.53

(n = 108)

Table 3-C

Factor III Items with Factor Loadings

Factor III - Defensiveness of Beliefs

Item	Factor Loading
12. I prefer not to read articles or books which cast doubt on my religious beliefs.	.49
16. It is better for a person's religious beliefs to be firm and free of doubt.	.46
19. Doubt is the opposite of religious faith.	.52
20. Mature faith does not need thought and reflection.	.48
24. Religious doubt allows us to learn.	-.48
25. I do not like to have my religious beliefs criticized.	.43
31. Religious doubt is the work of Satan.	.55
33. A person could not ever develop mature religious beliefs without doubt and questioning	-.41
39. I get very defensive when I defend my religious beliefs.	.48
41. Criticism of my religion is the work of Satan.	.47

(n = 108)

Table 3-D

Factor IV Items and Factor Loadings

Factor IV - Rigidity in Beliefs

Item	Factor Loading
<hr/>	
7. My understanding of God is the true one.	.42
18. My church's concept of God is the correct one.	.59
23. I have pretty much accepted my religious beliefs as they were taught me by my parents and/or church.	.76
30. I am virtually certain that my religious beliefs will always remain what they are today.	.54
38. I got my present religious beliefs from my parents.	.54

(n = 108)

Table 3-E

Factor V Items with Factor Loadings

Factor V - Concern for the Needs of Others

Item	Factor Loading
15. I don't worry about others as long as my needs are met.	-.54
17. I put the needs of others equal with my own needs.	.51
29. I generally put my needs above the needs of others.	-.56
32. No one cares as much for others as they do themselves.	-.49
35. I ask nothing from anyone and want no one to ask anything of me.	-.46
36. My religious beliefs are unimportant to my decision-making process.	-.42
42. Money and what it can buy are my top priorities in life.	-.46
44. The needs of other people are very important to me.	.60
45. I care for other people as much as I care for myself.	.58

(n = 108)

Table 3-F

Factor VI Items with Factor Loadings

Factor VI - Openness to Change in Religious Beliefs that Comes with Growth and Maturity

Item	Factor Loading
<hr/>	
1. I have often reexamined my religious beliefs.	.56
3. My religious beliefs may change in the future as I mature and learn.	.57
13. My religious beliefs are open to change.	.55
40. Hopefully, as one matures, religious understandings change and grow.	.55

(n = 108)

Table 3-G

Factor VII Items with Factor Loadings

Factor VII - Recognizing the Paradox in Truth

Item	Factor Loading
8. Some religious issues are not solved with one, infallible answer.	.50
10. Different beliefs on the same religious issue may both hold truth.	.40
14. There are always two ways to look at religious issues.	.58

(n = 108)

Table 4

First Order Factor Loadings on Second Order Factor

First Order Factors	Second Order Factors	
	A	B
I	-.14	.76
II	.85	-.05
III	.54	-.03
IV	.43	-.64
V	.10	.60
VI	.69	-.18
VII	.78	.11

(n = 108)

Table 5

Pearson Correlation Coefficients-Correlations between
Second Order Factors and Religion Scales

Second Order Factors	Religion Scales		
	Intrinsic	Extrinsic	Interactional
A	.30*	.20	.39*
B	-.67*	-.18	.04

*p < .01, (n = 108)

Table 6

Pearson Correlation Coefficients-Correlations between First
Order Factors and Religion Scales

First Order			
Factors	Intrinsic	Extrinsic	Interactional
I	-.70*	-.13	.05
II	.25*	.21	.39*
III	.21	.05	.21
IV	.29*	.09	.21
V	-.41*	-.19	-.01
VI	.21	.22*	.42*
VII	.16	.22*	.27*

*p < .01, (n = 108)

Table 7

Pearson Correlation Coefficients-Correlations between
Second Order Factors and Personality Scales

Second Order Factors	Personality Scales		
	Locus of Control	Social Desirability	Dogmatism
A	.07	.06	-.27*
B	-.32*	.35*	-.01

* $p < .01$, ($n = 108$)

Table 8

Pearson Correlation Coefficients-Correlations between First Order Factors and Personality Scales

First Order Factors	Personality Scales		
	Locus of Control	Social Desirability	Dogmatism
I	-.28*	.21	.05
II	.14	-.02	-.13
III	.07	.15	-.37*
IV	.07	-.01	-.23*
V	-.28*	.46*	-.10
VI	-.10	.05	-.06
VII	-.04	.01	-.11

*p < .01, (n = 108)

Table 9
Relationship of Components with Individual Scale Items

Definition Component	Scale Item
1, 7, 8	1. I have often reexamined my religious beliefs.
6	2. My daily moral and ethical decisions are based upon my religious beliefs.
1, 7, 8	3. My religious beliefs may change in the future as I mature and learn.
1, 7	5. There is only one correct way to view even complex religious questions.
1, 7, 8	7. My understanding of God is the true one.
2	8. Some religious issues are not solved with one, infallible answer.
6	9. My religious beliefs have greatly influenced the development of my value (belief) system.
2, 7	10. Different beliefs on the same religious issue may both hold truth.
6	11. Religion has little influence on my daily decisions.
1, 7, 8	12. I prefer not to read articles or books which cast doubt on my religious beliefs.
1, 7	13. My religious beliefs are open to change.
2	14. There are always two ways to look at religious issues.
3, 5, 6	15. I don't worry about others as long as my needs are met.
1, 7	16. It is better for a person's religious beliefs to be firm and free of doubt.

- | | |
|------------|---|
| 3, 4, 5, 6 | 17. I put the needs of others equal with my own needs. |
| 1, 8 | 18. My church's concept of God is the correct one. |
| 1, 7 | 19. Doubt is the opposite of religious faith. |
| 1, 7, 8 | 20. Mature faith does not need thought and reflection. |
| 7 | 21. Although I don't always agree with the religious beliefs of others, their beliefs may be as true as my own. |
| 1, 7, 8 | 22. Since my religious beliefs are right, there is no reason to expect them to change. |
| 1, 8 | 23. I have pretty much accepted my religious beliefs as they were taught me by my parents and/or church. |
| 1, 7 | 24. Religious doubt allows us to learn. |
| 7 | 25. I do not like to have my religious beliefs criticized. |
| 1, 7, 8 | 26. My personal religious belief may not be the only correct view of God. |
| 6 | 27. My religious beliefs define my moral beliefs. |
| 5, 6 | 28. Most of my moral decisions are based upon my religious beliefs. |
| 3, 4, 5, 6 | 29. I generally put my needs above the needs of others. |
| 1, 7 | 30. I am virtually certain that my religious beliefs will always remain what they are today. |
| 1, 7 | 31. Religious doubt is the work of Satan. |
| 3, 6 | 32. No one cares as much for others as they do themselves. |
| 1, 7, 8 | 33. A person could not ever develop mature religious beliefs without doubt and questioning. |

- | | |
|------------|--|
| 1, 2 | 34. Two differing viewpoints can both hold truth at the same time. |
| 3, 4, 6 | 35. I ask nothing from anyone and want no one to ask anything of me. |
| 3, 4, 6 | 36. My religious beliefs are unimportant to my decision-making process. |
| 6 | 37. My personal moral and value system is based upon my religious beliefs. |
| 1, 7, 8 | 38. I got my present religious beliefs from my parents. |
| 7, 8 | 39. I get very defensive when I defend my religious beliefs. |
| 1, 7, 8 | 40. Hopefully, as one matures, religious understandings change and grow. |
| 7 | 41. Criticism of my religion is the work of Satan. |
| 3, 5, 6 | 42. Money and what it can buy are my top priorities in life. |
| 1, 7 | 43. My faith is correct and therefore will not change. |
| 3, 4, 5, 6 | 44. The needs of other people are very important to me. |
| 3, 6 | 45. I care for other people as much as I care for myself. |
| 1, 7 | 46. My way of believing may not be the only correct way to believe. |
| 5, 6 | 47. My religious beliefs greatly influence my daily behavior. |
| 5, 6 | 48. My personal values are based upon my spiritual beliefs. |
-